SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

## **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provide by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docker sheet. (BES I	.01.001.01.01.01.11.21.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS			
NATHAN SICKAFO	OSE	NCO FINANCIA	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.		
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	County of Residence of	of First Listed Defendant		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Number and Email Add	lress) NOTE: IN LANI	D CONDEMNATION CASES, US	SE THE LOCATION OF THE	
Tara L. Patterson, Est Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 (215) 540-8888		LAND I Attorneys (If Known)	INVOLVED.		
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	▼ 3 Federal Question    (U.S. Government Not a Party)		<b>PF</b> DEF  1 □ 1 Incorporated <i>or</i> Pr  of Business In This		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity  (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2		
		Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				
CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
<ul> <li>□ 110 Insurance</li> <li>□ 120 Marine</li> <li>□ 130 Miller Act</li> <li>□ 140 Negotiable Instrument</li> <li>□ 150 Recovery of Overpayment &amp; Enforcement of Judgment</li> <li>□ 151 Medicare Act</li> <li>□ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)</li> <li>□ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits</li> <li>□ 160 Stockholders' Suits</li> <li>□ 190 Other Contract</li> <li>□ 195 Contract Product Liability</li> <li>□ 196 Franchise</li> <li>■ REAL PROPERTY</li> <li>□ 210 Land Condemnation</li> <li>□ 220 Foreclosure</li> <li>□ 230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>□ 240 Torts to Land</li> <li>□ 245 Tort Product Liability</li> <li>□ 290 All Other Real Property</li> </ul>	Slander   368 Asbestos Person: Liability   1340 Marine   345 Marine Product   1350 Motor Vehicle   355 Motor Vehicle   360 Other Personal   155 Motor Vehicle   1360 Other Personal   155 Motions to Vacal   155 Motions to Va	G20 Other Food & Drug   G25 Drug Related Seizure   of Property 21 USC 881   G30 Liquor Laws   G40 R.R. & Truck   G50 Airline Regs.   G60 Occupational   Safety/Health   G90 Other   LABOR   710 Fair Labor Standards   Act   720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations   730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting   & Disclosure Act   740 Railway Labor Act   790 Other Labor Litigation   791 Empl. Ret. Inc.   Security Act   IMMIGRATION   462 Naturalization Application   463 Habeas Corpus -	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 □ PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) □ FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	d00 State Reapportionment   410 Antitrust   430 Banks and Banking   450 Commerce   460 Deportation   470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations	
<b>№</b> 1 Original	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from	Reopened anothe	ferred from		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices A				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	N DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only <b>JURY DEMAND:</b>	if demanded in complaint:   Ves   No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
Explanation:					
10-13-	11 /S/ TARA L. PATTE	RSON			

## Case 2:11-cv-06409-GEKP Document 1 Filed 10/13/11 Page 2 of 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of					
Address of Plaintiff: 35/6 Lincoln Way East, Massillan, OH 44646						
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudentral Road Horsham DA 190416)						
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	11.1.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.					
(Use Reverse Side For Add	litional Space)					
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and						
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No□					
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No□					
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Date Terminated:					
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:					
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:						
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year						
	Yes No					
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit action in this court?	pending or within one year previously terminated					
	Yes□ No□					
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier num						
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No□					
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights c	ease filed by the same individual?					
	Yes□ No□					
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)						
<ul> <li>A. Federal Question Cases:</li> <li>1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:</li> <li>1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts</li> </ul>					
2. □ FELA						
	2. A Arrest Definition					
<ul><li>3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury</li><li>4. □ Antitrust</li></ul>	3. ☐ Assault, Defamation					
	4.  Marine Personal Injury					
5.   Patent  C.   Labor Management Polations	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury					
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. Dother Personal Injury (Please					
	specify)					
7. □ Civil Rights	7. Products Liability					
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos					
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases					
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)					
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases						
(Please specify)  ARBITRATION CERTIF	ICATION					
1, Two L Patheson, counsel of record do hereby certify:						
☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and bel \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	lief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of					
☐ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.						
10-13-11 Two I Dotters	88343					
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#					
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there h	•					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court						
except as noted above.	A					
DATE: 10-13-11 Iva L Patterson	88343					

Attorney-at-Law

Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (6/08)

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Nathan Sickaf	oose :		CIVIL ACTION		
v.		•			
v. NCO Financial S	ystems.Inc		NO.		
In accordance with the Civ plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and service of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	il Justice Expense an ase Management Trave a copy on all defende event that a defenda shall, with its first aparties, a Case Manage	ck Designation dants. (See § 1: nt does not agropearance, subnement Track De	ction Plan of this court, couns Form in all civil cases at the ti 03 of the plan set forth on the rece with the plaintiff regarding nit to the clerk of court and seresignation Form specifying the	me of everse g said eve on	
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE	E MANAGEM	ENT TRACKS:		
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.					
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.					
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.					
(e) Special Management – commonly referred to a the court. (See reverse management cases.)	s complex and that n	eed special or in	ntense management by	( )	
(f) Standard Management -	- Cases that do not fa	all into any one	of the other tracks.	( )	
10-13-11 Date 215-5210-8888	Toya   Pa 1 Attorney-at-la 877-788-	Herson in 19869	Nothan Sicka. Attorney for  tpatteren ocredita	feuse w.com	
Telephone	FAX Number	•	E-Mail Address		

(Civ. 660) 10/02

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

No.:
PLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
TRIAL  wful Debt Collection Practices)

### **COMPLAINT**

NATHAN SICKAFOOSE ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"):

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15
 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.
- 3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and as such, personal jurisdiction is established.
  - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Massillon, Ohio.
- 6. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).
- 7. Also, Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

  See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k.
- 12. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 13. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The

substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 14. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 15. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 16. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt and attempted to collect that debt from Plaintiff.
- 17. The debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for person, family, or household purposes.
- 18. Beginning in or around March 2011, Defendant continuously and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the debt.
- 19. Wanting to stop the collection calls, but knowing he did not currently have the money to pay the debt, Plaintiff made arrangements with Defendant to have the payment automatically withdrawn out of his checking account for a later date.
- 20. When the payment day approached, Plaintiff realized that he still did not have the money to pay the alleged debt, so he contacted Defendant to explain that he did not have enough funds available in his checking account to pay the alleged debt and withdrew his authorization for the automatic withdrawal of funds from his checking account.
- 21. Defendant threatened to withdrawal the funds from Plaintiff's checking account, despite having been told by Plaintiff that he did not have the funds available.
- 22. Also, Defendant threatened Plaintiff that it would take legal action if payment was not made, intentionally wanting to harm Plaintiff and cause injury, stress and fear, believing that to do so would intentionally increase the likelihood of the debt being paid by Plaintiff.
- 23. Upon information and belief, at the time it threatened to take legal action against Plaintiff, Defendant did not intend to take legal action and Defendant did not have authorization from the entity that placed the account with Defendant for collection.
  - 24. In a further attempt to harass Plaintiff into paying the alleged debt, Defendant

began constantly and continuously calling Plaintiff.

- 25. Defendant contacted Plaintiff, on average, once a day.
- 26. Also, Defendant contacted Plaintiff at times where it was inconvenient for him to receive debt collection calls, specifically calling him on at least one occasion after 9:00 p.m.
- 27. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were intended by Defendant to be disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- 28. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 29. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 30. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc.,

20

21 22

23

24

25

869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

## COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of 31. the following ways:
  - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
  - b. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff at a time or place known or which should have been known to be inconvenient;
  - c. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed or abused Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;
  - d. Defendant violated \$1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiff's phone to ring, and engaged Plaintiff in conversation repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff; and
  - e. Defendant violated \$1692e of the FDCPA when it used false, deceptive, of misleading representations in connection with the collection of a debt;

- f. Defendant violated §1692e(5) of the FDCPA when it threatened to take action that could not be legally taken or was not intended to be taken;
- g. Defendant violated §1692e(10) of the FDCPA when it used false representations or deceptive means in its attempt to collect a debt;
- h. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, NATHAN SICKAFOOSE, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutor y damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

#### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, NATHAN SICKAFOOSE, demands a jury trial in this case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Date: 10-13-11

By: 1748433

Tara L. Patterson
Attorney ID No. 88343

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-888

Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: tpatterson@creditlaw.com